



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,325	02/07/2001	Bruce S. Marks	A1019/20268	4861

3000 7590 12/01/2005  
CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,  
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.  
11TH FLOOR, SEVEN PENN CENTER  
1635 MARKET STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2212

EXAMINER
----------

FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,325

Applicant(s)

MARKS, BRUCE S.

Examiner

Lawrence D. Ferguson

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,11,14,28 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,11,14,28 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the amendment mailed September 14, 2005. Claims 1, 12, 28 and 31-33 were amended and claims 17 and 29-30 were cancelled rendering claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 14, 28 and 31-33 pending in this case.

The indicated allowability of claim 17 and 30 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Touhsaent (U.S. 6,013,353). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 11-12, 14, 28-29 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdelais et al (U.S. 6,472,034) in view of Touhsaent (U.S. 6,013,353).

Bourdelais discloses a multilayer, metallizable composite comprising core and surface layers (column 8, lines 60-67) where the material consists of a plastic film (column 7, lines 23-25) and comprising biaxially oriented polyolefin (column 7, lines 45-

Art Unit: 1774

48 and column 8, line 63). The core should be from 15 to 95% of the total thickness and the nonvoided skin(s) should be 5 to 85% of the sheet (column 9, lines 1-8). The voided biaxially oriented polyolefin sheets of Bourdelais provide opacity and whiteness to the composite (column 10, lines 48-52) where the material further comprises calcium carbonate (void creating additive) (column 12, lines 23-27). The reference discloses the material is a label, which is glue applied to a container (column 5, lines 25-30) which consists of cold glue sealing (column 4, lines 55-60). In instant claim 1, the phrases, 'oxidatively treated to receive a metal layer thereon' and introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Bourdelais does not show that the layers have a thickness or weight percent as in instant claimed. However, such features are properties which can be easily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art. With regard to the limitation of the thickness and weight percent, absent a showing of unexpected results, it is obvious to modify the conditions of a composition because they are merely the result of routine experimentation. The experimental modification of prior art in order to optimize operation conditions (e.g. thickness and weight percent) fails to render claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. All of the aforementioned limitations are optimizable as they directly affect the flexibility and durability of the label. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the label with the limitations of the thickness and weight percent since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Bourdelais does not teach a metal layer on the outer surface of one of the outer skin layers.

Touhsaent teaches a metallized multilayer composite comprising a core layer, two outer skin layers and a metal layer on the surface of one of the skin layers (column 1, line 51 through column 2, line 7 and Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have employed the metal layer on the outside of one of the skin layers, as taught in Touhsaent, in the multilayer composite of Bourdelais because the metal layer provides improved durability and reflectivity for the multilayer composite.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)***

4. Claims 1, 3, 11-12, 14, 28-29 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdelais et al (U.S. 6,472,034) in view of Squier et al (WO 02/059860).

Bourdelais discloses a multilayer, metallizable composite comprising core and surface layers (column 8, lines 60-67) where the material consists of a plastic film (column 7, lines 23-25) and comprising biaxially oriented polyolefin (column 7, lines 45-48 and column 8, line 63). The core should be from 15 to 95% of the total thickness and the nonvoided skin(s) should be 5 to 85% of the sheet (column 9, lines 1-8). The voided biaxially oriented polyolefin sheets of Bourdelais provide opacity and whiteness to the

Art Unit: 1774

composite (column 10, lines 48-52) where the material further comprises calcium carbonate (void creating additive) (column 12, lines 23-27). The reference discloses the material is a label, which is glue applied to a container (column 5, lines 25-30) which consists of cold glue sealing (column 4, lines 55-60). In instant claim 1, the phrases, 'oxidatively treated to receive a metal layer thereon' and introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Bourdelais does not show that the layers have a thickness or weight percent as in instant claimed. However, such features are properties which can be easily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art. With regard to the limitation of the thickness and weight percent, absent a showing of unexpected results, it is obvious to modify the conditions of a composition because they are merely the result of routine experimentation. The experimental modification of prior art in order to optimize operation conditions (e.g. thickness and weight percent) fails to render claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. All of the aforementioned limitations are optimizable as they directly affect the flexibility and durability of the label. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the label with the limitations of the thickness and weight percent since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617

Art Unit: 1774

USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Bourdelais does not teach a metal layer on the outer surface of one of the outer skin layers.

WO 02/059860 (WO '860) teaches a plastic label having a core layer and a first and second skin layer (page 8, first paragraph and fourth paragraph) where the metal layer is applied to the surface of an outer skin layer (page 8, last paragraph through page 9, first paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have employed the metal layer on the outside of one of the skin layers, as taught in WO '860, in the multilayer composite of Bourdelais because the metal layer boosts gloss and enhances machineability (page 9, first paragraph).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's remarks of 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdelais et al (U.S. 6,472,034) are moot based on grounds of new rejections.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is 571-272-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30PM.

Art Unit: 1774

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



L. Ferguson  
Patent Examiner  
AU 1774



RENA DYE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A.U. 1774 11/20/05